



**City of McMinnville**  
**Planning Department**  
231 NE Fifth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128  
(503) 434-7311

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

## EXHIBIT 2 - MINUTES

**January 5, 2021**  
**Historic Landmarks Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**

**3:00 pm**  
**Zoom Meeting**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Mary Beth Branch, Joan Drabkin, Christopher Knapp, John Mead, and Hadleigh Heller – Youth Liaison

**Members Absent:** Mark Cooley

**Staff Present:** Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

**Others Present:** Carson Benner, David & Jori Whitling, Jenny Berg, Ernie Munch, Lindsay Estep, Zane Johnson, and Scott Hill – Mayor

### 1. Call to Order

Chair Branch called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

### 2. Citizen Comments

None

### 3. Action Items

- A. HL 4-20: Certificate of Approval for Alteration - 806 SE Davis Street

Chair Branch asked if any Committee member had disclosures to make or wanted to abstain from participating or voting on this application. There were none. She asked if any Committee member needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant, any other party involved in the application, or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this application. There were none.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a request for a certificate of approval for exterior alterations at 806 SE Davis Street. The property was listed on the local historic resources inventory as a significant resource which made it a historic landmark. He described the existing condition of the structure. The alterations proposed were: removal of two existing porch additions, alterations to those facades after they were exposed, extension of the roof over the entrance of the structure, and removal of the chimney. He discussed the review criteria and Secretary of Interior standards. The applicant planned to follow the rehabilitation treatment which allowed alterations to historic resources. For the removal of the two additions, the applicant provided evidence showing that they appeared to be later additions. They were not significant and removing them would not detract from the historic

character of the site. The additions were located on the rear of the structure. Staff had researched when they might have been constructed, and it appeared they were later additions. Regarding removal of the chimney, they were requesting removal and patching it with the siding materials from the additions. They were making changes to the interior of the structure and removing the fireplace. Staff did not think there was enough evidence provided that supported the complete removal of the chimney. The chimney appeared to be original and the removal of the chimney would reduce the historic character of the building. There was no evidence in the application on the condition of the chimney to warrant its removal. Staff thought the chimney should remain, unless with the interior work it had to be removed in which case it should be reconstructed in its same form. Regarding the extension of the gable roofline, the applicant wanted to extend it in its same form, size, and height by four feet to provide a covered walkway between the two entrances. The proposal was on the rear of the structure on a building façade that was not as historically significant as the front and other sides and was in an area that had already been altered over time already. The gable form and height would be extended and the siding would match the remainder of the structure. The applicant was proposing to add columns that matched the existing front porch. Regarding the changes to the facades once they were exposed, the windows and doors would be relocated and replaced to allow for better functionality and a new window would be installed on the south façade. The new openings would be in locations that were not as historically significant or highly visible. The alterations would not duplicate any historic fenestration pattern, however the applicant was proposing more modern fiberglass building materials. Since the majority of the structure contained original siding and wood trim. Staff suggested if the HLC was supportive of the window and door alterations, the new materials would be wood to match and be more consistent with the historic materials of the home. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions. He then reviewed the conditions.

Committee Member Drabkin asked if the new windows would have the same trim as the horizontal window on the second floor. Senior Planner Darnell said the applicant was proposing one by four wood trim for the windows and doors which matched the existing trim. It was also a condition of approval. The more decorative exterior window headers on the house would not need to be matched.

Committee Member Drabkin asked for clarification on the doors. Senior Planner Darnell explained their proposed location.

Carson Benner, representing the applicants, said they would duplicate the existing trim that was adjacent to this area of the house. Regarding the chimney, the applicants intended to remove the fireplace and reconfigure the kitchen so the kitchen and living room were one space. The brick fireplace was substantial and the amount of chimney above the roofline weighed 6,000 to 8,000 pounds. It was not feasible to build a wood structure to support it that would be safe. The applicants would like to eliminate the chimney entirely because it was not visible or if that was not acceptable, to rebuild it out of wood and put a brick façade around it. The brick would match in appearance but it would be a lighter veneer. One of the things they found in the remodel was a window behind the cabinets in the kitchen which showed that at one time the porches were not there. It was hard to tell when they were added, but it was clear that they were added on. Removing those and extending the gable seemed to be appropriate for that time period. The back of the house was just a series of outbuildings that were connected. They were suggesting to add more integrity to it and finish it.

David & Jori Whitling, applicants, said they were supportive of the conditions for the windows and doors to be wood products that more closely matched the historic character.

Committee Member Drabkin had visited the site and could not see the chimney from the public right-of-way. She thought this application would improve the house.

Ms. Whitling said their goal was to bring the historic home back to its former glory.

Committee Member Knapp asked about the material for the columns.

Mr. Benner said they would be wood.

Committee Member Knapp confirmed the chimney could not be seen from the street.

Chair Branch asked about the soffit and eave details of the extension of the gable roof. Mr. Benner said the intention was to reuse what was already there or to duplicate the details.

Chair Branch asked about the height of the ceiling under the new porch. Mr. Benner said it followed the ceiling height of the existing structure.

Chair Branch appreciated the column replication, however the plans showed them coming all the way up to the beginning of the eave and soffit. She suggested having more of a design that was in line with the front porch where the columns met the structural header beam instead of going all the way up to the eaves and intersecting with the new porch ceiling. She also asked about the siding on the gable extension and changing the roof style. Mr. Benner said they had looked at many different roof styles and a shed roof did not feel right. The gable extension felt like it was the best thing to keep the integrity of the shape. He thought they could recess the siding further back so it disappeared.

Chair Branch asked about the siding on the house. Mr. Benner said it was a shiplap. The goal was when the back structures were disassembled to save the siding and reuse it. If they had to use new wood, it did not look like a unique profile.

Committee Member Drabkin asked about the porch material. Mr. Benner said they were proposing simple cedar decking which would be durable and safe.

Chair Branch closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Chair Branch asked for Committee direction on the chimney.

Committee Member Knapp was in favor of reproducing the chimney in wood with a brick façade to keep the historic integrity.

Chair Drabkin was also in favor of it being replicated. It was an essential design of the house.

Committee Member Mead agreed. He thought color might be a question and he suggested staff approval for the brick color selection to make sure it matched the original.

Committee Member Knapp suggested using some of the original brick.

Chair Branch suggested adding language to allow the chimney to be reconstructed with wood framing and a thin brick veneer if necessary with staff approval of the final color to match the original as closely as possible. A new condition would be that the rear porch columns and siding would match the configuration of the front porch columns and siding.

Based on the findings of fact, the conclusionary findings for approval, and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Mead moved to approve HL 4-20 subject to the conditions of approval in the decision document to be amended to add that thin brick veneer shall be allowed with staff approval of the brick color and adding a condition that the rear porch columns and siding match the configuration of the front porch columns and siding. The motion was seconded by Chair Branch and passed 5-0.

B. HL 5-20: Certificate of Approval for Alteration - 225 NW Adams Street

Chair Branch asked if any Committee member had disclosures to make or wanted to abstain from participating or voting on this application. Committee Member Mead would be recusing himself from this discussion and vote due to his relationship with the applicant.

Chair Branch asked if any Committee member needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant, any other party involved in the application, or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this application. There were none.

Senior Planner Darnell said this was a request for a certificate of approval for an alteration to 225 NW Adams Street. The library property was a historic landmark listed as distinctive on the historic resources inventory. He showed the location of where the hand railing would be installed on the sides of the steps leading to the doors, from the first to the last step. Due to Covid, the flow through the building had been changed and what was historically the main entrance was only an exit now. It created a one way traffic pattern through the building. There was a need for railings to assist the accessibility to the entrance. He showed pictures of the proposed railings which met applicable code standards. He explained the approval criteria and summarized the findings. The proposed installation method avoided impact to any character defining features of the historic landmark. The handrails were proposed to be mounted only to the concrete steps and landing. The proposed handrails were simple, black powder coated metal railings. There was no attempt to mimic historic features. He showed historic photos of the entrance with some form of railing in the past. It was not clear if they were original or compatible with the building more than what was being proposed. Staff thought the "preservation" treatment was most applicable to the application because it allowed for limited and sensitive upgrading to allow the property to be functional. There were code related recommended guidelines that spoke to allowing for barrier-free access and completing code required work that did not impact the character defining exterior features of the structure. Staff thought the proposed style and form of the handrails was minimal. The addition of the handrails would improve accessibility. The installation method would not impact the building itself or any historic features. The proposed materials and style were minimal and did not detract from the character defining features of the building or its setting. Staff recommended approval with no conditions.

Committee Member Drabkin said the design of the railing was not consistent with a 1912 building. It needed to be a simpler design. She did not want to delay the project as the utmost concern was safety.

Jenny Berg, applicant, said the only examples she was able to find for the railings were very elaborate. If Committee Member Drabkin had an example, she would be interested to see it. The railings were being put in for safety reasons. She had tried to keep them as low profile as possible. If they could use the same entrance and exit again in the future, the handrails could be removed.

Chair Branch closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Chair Branch struggled between how new was not supposed to look like the original but it should be compatible. She was not sure what was appropriate.

Committee Member Drabkin had four simple designs she could share with the applicant.

Senior Planner Darnell noted there were height and size dimensions that were necessary to meet code. He showed example photos of past railings.

Committee Member Knapp agreed the railings were a necessity and he had no issue with what was being proposed.

Chair Branch said this was a commercial building with high traffic and there was great need for safety and being up to code compliance. There was no existing structure the railings were replacing or mimicking. It was not touching the building. She was comfortable leaving it up to the library and City on the design.

There was consensus that the overall approach, location proposed, and size in general was acceptable, but the Committee was flexible with the design.

Based on the findings of fact, the conclusionary findings for approval, and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Drabkin moved to approve HL 5-20 as long as the placement, overall simplicity, materials, and color were as proposed. The motion was seconded by Chair Branch and passed 4-0.

C. HL 7-20: Certificate of Approval for Alteration - 608 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street

Chair Branch asked if any Committee member had disclosures to make or wanted to abstain from participating or voting on this application. There were none. She asked if any Committee member needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant, any other party involved in the application, or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this application. There were none.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the certificate of approval request for alteration at 608 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. He explained the site location. This was a historic landmark listed as distinctive on the historic resources inventory. It was also listed as secondary significant in the historic district. The existing property description was outdated after recent rehab work. He showed the existing condition of the alley façade and the proposed alterations. The changes were for better ventilation to the hood that would serve the kitchen for the restaurant going into the building. He discussed the review criteria. In general the proposal preserved and avoided impact to the primary building facades that were most character-defining. The alley façade was more utilitarian in nature, non-primary, and less visible. The alley façade had been altered already with no historic stucco finish. There would be one new opening and one replacement of window glazing. The installation method proposed would be visually compatible and would allow for a transition back to a window in the future. The applicant was proposing a "rehabilitation" treatment. The Secretary of the Interior's recommended guidelines for installing a new mechanical system was that it resulted in the least alteration possible to the historic building and its character-defining features and to conceal ductwork when possible. The standards regarding windows were to add new window openings on the rear or other secondary, less visible elevations and that the new openings would not damage or destroy significant features. Staff recommended approval with one condition, that the louvers be finished as proposed in the application.

Committee Member Mead asked about painting the louvers to match the color of the windows. Senior Planner Darnell clarified that meant paint them the color of the window frames.

Ernie Munch, applicant, said the kitchen split into two parts, the main kitchen would be on the ground level with a type 1 hood and the prep kitchen would be in the basement with a type 2 hood. One would get exhausted out of the roof and one through the alley. The intent was to paint the louver coming through the existing window the dark color of the existing trim and the new opening would be on the same plane as the wall and would be painted the same color as the wall.

Chair Branch closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Based on the findings of fact, the conclusionary findings for approval, and the materials submitted by the applicant, Committee Member Drabkin moved to approve HL 7-20 subject to the condition of approval provided in the decision document. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Knapp and passed 5-0.

Mr. Munch discussed how a grandchild of Sarah Fletcher, who was responsible for several real estate transfers in this area, had been found. The grandchild provided photos and original deeds. He shared the photos and history of Ms. Fletcher and of the former building with the Committee. He also discussed what was found when they dug up the building.

#### **4. Committee Comments**

Chair Branch had received an email from a citizen who was concerned about the brick and grout color on the First Federal building. Senior Planner Darnell had reached out to the project manager and shared with him the color samples that had been approved. They were attempting to install everything as was approved and invited him to see the mock up that was done. He met with them and the brick that was being installed was the brick color that was approved. The grout color was not consistent as it was much darker than the brick. Once it was cleaned and sealed it would be lighter. However, it would be a gray color instead of a tan. It would still be visibly lighter than the brick. He and Chair Branch confirmed that it met the intent of the approval.

Chair Branch said while they were there, the applicant showed them the stain proposal for the tongue and groove cedar which the Committee did not approve as it appeared as natural wood. The applicant was coming up with additional samples.

#### **5. Staff Comments**

Senior Planner Darnell verified that a subcommittee to review the downtown design standards and bring back recommendations to the Committee was acceptable. He was available to be involved in those discussions. There would be another Committee meeting later in January.

#### **6. Adjournment**

Chair Branch adjourned the meeting at 5:14 p.m.

